

REMARKS

The application was filed with seventeen claims. Claims 2 and 15 are amended in this paper. Claims 1-17 remain pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's acknowledgement of the Office's receipt of the priority documents.

The disclosure was objected to for "various grammatical and typographical errors." Corrections have been made at the specific locations cited by the Examiner. In addition, extensive changes were required to pages 7-15 in particular. Errors were present in the original disclosure. These errors apparently arose from an incompatibility between fonts used in the Applicant's document and the version printed for filing by Applicant's counsel. These font errors were primarily present in the formulae and the associated mathematical description. Substitute pages 7-15 are provided in this paper, but the nature of the errors has made it impossible for Applicant's counsel to provide a marked up version showing the changes made to these pages. Specifically, Applicant's counsel is unable to reproduce in this document the errors originally present in the specification, so it has not been possible to generate a marked up version according to the usual practice. The substitute pages have the proper formulae and mathematical descriptions, and the Examiner is asked to substitute these pages in place of the ones originally filed.

Objections were made to the wording of claim 2. Claim 2 has now been amended to remove the errors objected to.

Claims 1-17 are pending. Of these, claims 1, 4, and 15 are independent.

Claim 1 requires a motor stator that is wrapped with two independent windings and which is "formed from a plurality of individual stator core sections" joined together to form the overall stator. The Examiner alleges that the Oishi reference teaches many of the features of claim 1. The Examiner admits, though,

that Oishi does not describe a motor whose stator is made of a plurality of individual stator core sections.

The Examiner asserts that this deficiency of the Oishi reference is remedied by Blumenstock, which describes a magnetic bearing with a stator core that comprises multiple individual sections. Blumenstock's device is not a motor, though. It is merely a magnetic bearing. As such, Blumenstock lacks the two independent windings the claim 1 requires.

Applicant submits that the Examiner's combination of Oishi with Blumenstock is an improper one and that the invention of claim 1 is thus not obvious in view of those two references. First, Blumenstock describes a magnetic bearing rather than a magnetic levitation motor. Blumenstock's field of endeavor is sufficiently different from the claimed invention that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have looked to Blumenstock for the solution to his problem.

The invention, moreover, addresses the problem of how to wind two independent windings on a common stator. This is not a problem relevant to Blumenstock, though, as the device of that reference has only a single coil. There is thus nothing in either Oishi or Blumenstock that suggests the combination the Examiner is asserting. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that this rejection be withdrawn. If the Examiner persists in this rejection, Applicant asks that the Examiner state specifically under what rationale one of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to consider Blumenstock as a potential source for the solution to his problem, and what in the prior art would suggest specifically the combination of art the Examiner is relying on. The Examiner's cooperation in this regard will be most appreciated.

Claim 4 is similar to claim 1 in requiring two independent windings and a stator core that is formed from a plurality of stator core sections. This claim is alleged to be obvious in view of a combination of Oishi, Blumenstock, and a further reference - Higuchi. As with claim 1, Applicant asserts that the Blumenstock reference deals with a different class of devices, bearings rather than motors. The Blumenstock device, moreover, has only a single set of windings. One of ordinary

skill in the art would not look to Blumenstock, therefore, for an answer to the question of how to wrap *two* sets of windings on a single stator core. There is thus nothing in the art itself that suggests the combination the Examiner is asserting, and the withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent claim 15 has been amended in this paper to require winding first and second windings around individual stator core sections, and then connecting the sides of those sections together to form the overall stator core. These limitations correspond substantially to the limitations described above in connection with claims 1 and 4. Claim 15 is thus asserted to be patentable over the asserted combination of Oishi with Blumenstock for substantially the same reasons.

Each of claims 1, 4, and 15 is patentable for the reasons described above. Each of the remaining claims depends from one of these claims and should therefore be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6711 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: June 18, 2002

By:



Michael L. Crapenhof
Registration No. 37,115
Attorney for Applicant

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701